## **TRAAK Project Evaluation Criteria** (see appendix for a summary of proposed changes)

Criteria are for TRAAK Projects not involving a related improvement to a highway, road, ferry or transit project.

	Scoring Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)	
1. Health and quality of	This project provides a	This project provides a	Project will have no affect	This project provides a	This project provides a	
life	significant contribution	moderate contribution to	either positive or negative	moderate degradation	significant degradation	
Air and water quality,	to improved health or	improved health or	on quality of life issues.	to health or quality of	to health or quality of	
neighborhood continuity,	quality of life through	quality of life through		life.	life.	
enhanced recreational	reduction or removal of	reduction or removal of				
opportunities, enhanced	existing negative factor	existing negative factor				
understanding of natural	or provision of a new	or provision of a new				
and manmade environment	facility that improves	facility that improves				
Weighting: 4	quality of life.	quality of life.				
2. Safety.	Addresses demonstrated	Addresses demonstrated	Project does not have a	Project will have a	Project will have a	
	safety problem of	safety problem of	safety component.	minor adverse affect	major adverse effect	
	significance.	moderate nature or there		on safety.	on safety.	
		is a record of public				
Weighting: 5		concern.				
3a. Local, other agency or	Contributions covers	Note: award 1 point for	No contribution.	N/A	N/A	
user contribution to <b>fund</b>	25% or more of project	each 5% contribution.				
capital costs excluding	costs.					
land.	Note: award 1 point for					
Weighting: 4	each 5% contribution.					
3b. Local, other agency or	Contribution of land for	Contribution of land for	Public agency provides	N/A	N/A	
user contribution of <b>land</b> to	entire facility, plus	less than entire facility	(non-dedicated) land for			
project.	change of land status to	plus permanent	project: 2 pts.			
	permanently dedicate	dedication: points				
****	land for project.	proportionate to land				
Weighting: 4	C :11	contributed for project.	G	27/4	27/4	
4a. Local, other agency or	Sponsor will assume	Sponsor will assume full	Sponsor contributes	N/A	N/A	
user contribution to	ownership of DOT&PF	M&O responsibility of	nothing.			
assume ownership,	facility; or sponsor will	DOT&PF facility; or				
including operations & maintenance costs.	assume ownership of another DOT&PF	sponsor will assume full M&O of another				
maintenance costs.	facility of similar M&O	DOT&PF facility of				
Commitment must be in	cost.	similar M&O cost.				
writing before points will	COSt.	Sillingi ivice Cost.				
be assigned.						
Weighting: 4						
Weighting. 4						

**TRAAK Project Evaluation Criteria** (see appendix for a summary of proposed changes)

			Scoring Criteria		
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)
4b. Local, other agency or user contribution to fund operations and maintenance (O&M) costs. (Use for non-DOT facilities). Weighting: 3	Sponsor will assume ownership of and maintenance responsibility for new facility.	Sponsor will assume full M&O responsibility (but not ownership); or sponsor will assume full M&O of another DOT&PF facility of similar M&O cost	Continued sponsor ownership & operation of locally-owned facility = 2 pts.; and results in significant local maintenance savings = 3 pts.	Sponsor assumes ownership, but not M&O responsibility	Sponsor assumes neither ownership nor M&O responsibility
5. Public support.  Weighting: 4	Preponderance of public record including a resolution from the local elected body shows support for project and fully supported in official State, local <i>or Federal</i> plans.	Majority of public record shows support for project and fully supported in official State, local or Federal plans (4); or nominally supported in official State, local or Federal plans (3).	Public record is divided or undocumented toward project	Majority of public record shows opposition to project; and not supported in official State, local <i>or Federal</i> plans.	Preponderance of public record shows opposition to project including a resolution from the local elected body and contravenes official State, local <i>or Federal</i> plans.
6. Project bridges gap or removes barrier between existing trail systems or provides interpretive center or rest area continuity.  Weighting: 2	Project provides an important connection (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	Project provides a modest connection. (bridges gap, removes barrier or provides interp. or rest area continuity).	No gaps bridged or barriers removed but does connect to existing networks.	Project creates barrier or displaces existing non-motorized uses.	N/A
7. Project is tied to an annual recreational, educational or tourism event or activity? This project would strongly support/sustain this event/?  Weighting: 2	Event or activity is of statewide or regional significance and well known/long standing. Yes to both (5), yes to one (4).	Event or activity is local and well known/long standing. Yes to both (3) or yes to one (2). Event is new but growing in importance (1).	Event is minor and local.	N/A	N/A

**TRAAK Project Evaluation Criteria** (see appendix for a summary of proposed changes)

	Scoring Criteria					
Standards	(5)	(3)	(0)	(-3)	(-5)	
8. Any of the six	One point for each one;	(See to left.)	None.	N/A	N/A	
intrinsic qualities:	maximum 5. Project					
scenic, historic,	must include					
cultural, natural,	interpretation of					
archaeological,	historic, cultural,					
recreational.	natural and					
Weighting: 3	archaeological					
	attributes for points.					
9. Project includes	Nomination includes	Nomination includes	Project does not		Project will harm or	
Stabilization or	letter or other	letter of support from	include stabilization or		reduce in value an	
renovation of a historic	documentation of	Office of History &	renovation of a historic		historic property.	
property related to	inclusion of the	Archeology that	property.			
transportation	renovated property on	declares the property to				
	the National Historic	be of significant (4 or				
	Register.	3), or of moderate (2 or				
		1) historical				
Weighting: 4		importance.				
10. Capital cost	Total project cost (all	Total project cost (all	Total project cost (all	N/A	N/A	
	phases):	phases):	phases):			
	\$250,000  or less = 5	\$250,000-\$500,000 = 3	\$500,000-\$750,000 = 1			
Weighting: 4			\$750,000  or more = 0			
11. Other factors not	Project exhibits	Project exhibits	Project exhibits no	N/A	N/A	
specified.	significant innovation,	moderate innovation,	innovation, creativity or			
	creativity or unique	creativity or unique	unique benefits not			
	benefits not otherwise	benefits not otherwise	otherwise rated.			
Weighting: 2	rated.	rated.				

Total Weight = 45